Remarks

Claims 1-10, 12-15, and 21-28 are pending in the present application. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration and allowance are requested in view of the above amendments and the remarks below.

Claims 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 16-20.

Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Guerrero et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,058,905), hereafter "Guerrero." This rejection is defective because Guerrero fails to disclose each and every feature set forth in the claims as required by 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Independent claim 1 recites:

> "A method for providing a compact interface for display of an
> object hierarchy having a plurality of levels, comprising:
> displaying a first level root node of the object hierarchy in a
> first window;
> upon selection of the first level root node in the first window,
> displaying a pop-up window that includes a listing of all second
> level child nodes of the first level root node immediately adjacent
> and to a right side of the first level root node in the first window; and

selecting one of the second level child nodes from the listing of all second level child nodes included in the pop-up window;

wherein, upon selection of one of the second level child nodes, the pop-up window that includes the listing of all second level child nodes of the first level root node disappears from the first window, and is replaced by the selected second level child node, which is displayed immediately adjacent and to the right side of the first level root node in the first window, wherein the first level root node and the selected second level child node are displayed in a linear horizontal arrangement in the first window, and wherein a depth of a navigation path through the object hierarchy increases from left to right in the first window."

Regarding independent claim 1, Guerrero fails to disclose, *inter alia*, the features of "upon selection of the first level root node, displaying a **pop-up window** that includes a listing of all second level child nodes of the first level root node immediately **adjacent and to a right side** of the first level root node in the first window," "selecting one of the second level child nodes from the listing of all second level child nodes included in the pop-up window, " and "wherein, upon selection of one of the second level child nodes, the pop-up window that includes the listing of all second level child nodes of the first level root node disappears from the first window, and is replaced by the selected second level child node, which is displayed immediately adjacent and to the right side of the first level root node in the first window, wherein the first level root node and the selected second level child node are displayed in a linear horizontal arrangement in the

first window, and wherein a depth of a navigation path through the object hierarchy increases from left to right in the first window."

On the contrary, as illustrated in FIG. 6A of Guerrero, the window 506 is displayed below the window 504, **not adjacent and to the right of the window 504** as claimed. Further, as admitted by the Examiner, Guerrero fails to disclose the use of the claimed pop-up window. Applicants agree. To overcome this glaring deficiency, the Examiner concludes that since "Guerrero teaches the vertical browser that comprises a path list and a choice list in separate areas (windows)," "it would have been obvious … that such a separate area (window) of the vertical browser could be a pop-up window." Applicants disagree and submit that Guerrero is completely silent with regard to the use of pop-up windows. This is clearly demonstrated by Guerrero since the choice window 506 displayed in FIG. 6A **remains present** as shown in FIG. 6B (i.e., is not a pop-up window), upon selection of one of the entries in the choice window 506. The only time the choice window 506 is not displayed is when the selected entry is a leaf node -- otherwise the choice window 506 is always displayed. Thus, Guerrero clearly teaches away from the use of a pop-up window.

It is further noted that the choice window 506 in Guerrero is not **replaced** by a selected entry as claimed. On the contrary, comparing FIGS. 6A and 6B, for example, it is clear that the choice window 506 is updated to display the children of an entry selected in the choice window 506, and not to display the entry itself (see also, col. 7, lines 36-45).

10/737,300
- 15 -

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is allowable. Further, Applicants submit that independent claims 9 and 21 are allowable for reasons similar to those set forth with regard to independent claim 1.

With respect to the dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features. For example, regarding dependent claims 5-7, 13-15, and 25-27, Guerrero fails to disclose the selection of a node and the display of a pop-window, containing siblings of the selected node, **over the selected node**.

If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/ John A. Merecki /

Dated: June 15, 2007

John A. Merecki
Reg. No. 35,812

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, NY 12207
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile

10/737,300

- 16 -